UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/321,594	05/28/1999	ALAN J. DEMERS	50277-313	6698

7590 10/03/2002

Ditthavong & Carlson P C
10507 Braddock Road
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032

EXAMINER
ROMERO, ALMARI C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/321,594	Applicant(s) DEMERS ET AL.	
	Examiner Almari Romero	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 August 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to communications: Preliminary Amendment filed on 8/05/02.

2. Claims 1-10 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldring (USPN 5,440,735 – issued on 8/08/1995) in view of Suzuki et al. (USPN 6,003,067 – filed on 6/23/1997).**

Regarding independent claim 1, Goldring discloses:

A method of propagating changes to a table (Goldring on col. 5, lines 2-11: teaches updates (changes) propagated to various table copies), comprising the steps of:

maintaining a first copy of the table at a first site (Goldring on col. 3, line 67 and col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches each user with snapshot copy of a table (one copy for user 16));

maintaining a second copy of the table at a second site (Goldring on col. 3, line 67 and col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches snapshot copy of a table for user 18, 20); and

transmitting changes of the first copy of the table from the first site to the second site (Goldring on col. 5, lines 2-11: teaches update changes of one table copy propagated to various table copies);

updating the second copy of the table at the second site based on the transmitted changes (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches updating user tables);

wherein the first copy of the table and the second copy of the table have at least one column (Goldring on col. 5, lines 2-11: teaches various columns of user tables are also changed).

However, Goldring does not explicitly disclose "non-overlapping column".

Suzuki et al. (Suzuki) on col. 2, lines 20-49: teaches judging whether or not at least one unit of screen data area (column) of the display area are superposed (overlap)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Suzuki discloses:

wherein the non-overlapping column is present in the first copy and missing in the second copy (Suzuki et al. (Suzuki) on col. 2, lines 20-49: teaches hidden area not displayed to the first information processing apparatus (client) but displayed in the second information processing apparatus (server or teacher)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of

the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Suzuki discloses:

wherein the non-overlapping column is missing in the first copy and present in the second copy (Suzuki on col. 2, lines 50-62: teaches unit of screen data not displayed in the display area in the second information processing apparatus (server)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Goldring discloses:

comprising the step of reconciling differences in the column shape of the first copy and the column shape of the second copy for the transmitted changes (Goldring on col. 6, lines 18-23: teaches differential changes).

Regarding dependent claim 5, Suzuki discloses:

comprising the step of defining a top flavor describing overlapping columns and non-overlapping columns of the table (Suzuki on col. 2, lines 20-62: teaches determining whether or not display area are superposed on each other, detecting if hidden area are superposed in display areas).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Goldring discloses:

comprising the steps of: defining a first flavor describing the columns of the first copy; and transmitting an indicator of the first flavor from the first site to the second site (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68 and col. 5, lines 2-11: teaches columns in user table and various table copies in other users 18, 20).

Regarding dependent claim 7, Goldring discloses:

comprising the steps of : defining a second flavor describing the columns of the second copy and wherein the step of updating the second copy of the table at the second site based on the transmitted changes includes the step of updating columns between the first flavor and the second flavor in the second copy of the table (Goldring on col. 5, lines 2-11 and col. 6, lines 18-23: teaches propagating changes and updating changes to table copies) and (Suzuki on col. 2, lines 20-49: teaches judging whether or not at least one unit of screen data area (column) of the display area are superposed (overlap)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to

another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Goldring discloses:

the step of maintaining a first copy of the table at a first site includes the step of maintaining an updatable snapshot at a laptop computer site and the step of maintaining a second copy of the table at the second site includes the step of maintaining a master table at a master site (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches updatable snapshot copies between users 16, 18, and 20);

Regarding independent claim 9, Goldring discloses:

A method of modifying a table to drop a first column and add a second column, said table being replicated at a plurality of sites (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches snapshot copies of tables in users 16, 18, 20), comprising the steps of:

(a) defining a first flavor for a first site, said first flavor describing the table as having both the first column and the second column (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68 and col. 5, lines 2-11: teaches various columns of user tables in user 16);

(c) defining a second flavor for a second site, said second flavor describing the table as having the second column but not the first column (Goldring on col. 4, lines 64-68: teaches snapshot copy of the table with columns in users 18, 20);

However, Goldring does not explicitly disclose, "adding the second column to the table at the first site, dropping the first column and adding the second column to the table at the second site" and "dropping the first column from the table at the first site".

Suzuki on col. 2, lines 20-62: teaches detecting whether or not screen data is displayed (missing) and on col. 8, lines 61-67: teaches adding and removing changed hidden area form screen data (adding and dropping columns) .

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to add or drop hidden area a unit of screen data (column) and also determine whether or not the unit of screen data is displayed based on updating changes transmitted from one user site to another user site in a data processing environment.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Bauer discloses:

transmitting changes to the table from the first site to the second site; and updating the second copy of the table at the second site based on overlapping columns between the first flavor and the second flavor (Goldring on col. 5, lines 2-11 and col. 6, lines 18-23: teaches propagating changes and updating changes to table copies) and (Suzuki on col. 2, lines 20-49: teaches judging whether or not at least one unit of screen data area (column) of the display area are superposed (overlap)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Suzuki into Goldring to provide a way to detect if a unit of the screen data is superposed in the display area when propagating changes to one user site to another user site in order to reduce transmission data amount in a data transmission processing environment.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Romero whose telephone number is (703) 305-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Thursdays (7:30am - 6:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

AR
September 25, 2002

HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100